

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 16-33 are pending in the present application. Claims 3, 8-15 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 16, 21, and 30 are independent.

Summary of Examiner Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to their representative, Michael Cammarata, during the interview conducted on August 16, 2007. During this interview, the Reardon, Dorfman, and Palm references were discussed with a particular focus on Dorfman and Reardon. Also, a proposed amendment to claim 1 was discussed in detail and that same amendment is being made herein to claim 1 with similar amendments being made to the other independent claims (16, 21, and 30). The prior art arguments are repeated below. After listening to these arguments and considering the amendment, the Examiners tentatively agreed that the amendment appears to overcome the prior art of record. Applicants now ask for a final decision, hopefully consistent with the tentative decision reached during the interview.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Dorfman-Reardon Rejection

It appears that claims 1-3, 5-7, 30, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorfman (USP 6,449,651) in view of Reardon (USP 6,212,635). Applicants utilize the word “appears” because the Statement of Rejection recites claims “1-x” but from the detailed explanation of the rejection, Applicants were able to surmise which claims were actually being rejected on this combination of prior art. In any event, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants hereby incorporate the previous arguments made against Dorfman. In brief summary, Dorfman merely discloses a variation of hardware dongles which are physically attached to the communication channel. Dorfman’s dongles utilize an encryption key logarithm as well as a date range to ensure secure access through the dongle. If the dongle’s access period has expired or if the encryption key does not match, access is denied. Clearly, Dorfman’s solution to remote computer access requires the use of such hardware dongles. This is an entirely different concept of operation and certainly does not teach or suggest the invention, particularly as recited in the amended independent claims. The Examiner’s generally agreed

with this assessment during the interview. Specifically, Dorfman fails to disclose or suggest the “management port” concept in which a management port is deemed to be the only port authorized for receiving management commands. Indeed, the Office Action further agrees that this position at least as reflected at the top of page 3.

Reardon is applied to teach the management port concept. Applicants disagree. As also discussed during the interview, Reardon discloses a security gateway 12 (see Fig. 1) which provides a user with greater control over a computer’s access to its peripheral devices. The authorized user receives a token which is essentially a private key in an encryption key pair which permits the user to configure the security gateway to completely or partially disable the peripheral devices. In other words, a first token issued to a first user would permit that first user to access, for example, only printing devices connected to the computer via the security gateway. A second user with higher security clearance may receive a second token granting that second user greater security access such that the second user can access both the printer and disk drive.

In sum, Reardon’s system is a user based system in which authorized users can protect data and programs stored in various peripheral devices wherein the token is otherwise a means for verification of identity of users. This is best described in Column 4, lines 53-61; Column 5, lines 12-15 and Column 11, line 33 - Column 12, line 9. Reardon summarizes the advantages achieved by his user based security protocols in Column 29, lines 24-48.

Such a user centered security system utilizing tokens certainly does not disclose or suggest the management port concept as variously recited in the independent claims. More specifically, the combination of Reardon and Dorfman does not disclose or suggest the features of amended independent claim 1 including predetermining one port of the computer as a management port and deeming the management port as the only port authorized for receiving one or more management commands and all other ports as not automatically authorized for receiving any management command. This combination of applied art also does not disclose or suggest the further step of claim 1 reciting that if the management command is received at the management port, executing the management command without requiring further authentication or authorization and if the management command is received at the second port (not the management port) ignoring the management command.

In contrast, Dorfman's dongles necessitate encryption key authorization embedded in the hardware dongles. Furthermore, the Reardon system requires a token for a user to configure peripheral devices none of which even remotely teach or suggest a management port concept as recited in independent claim 1.

Furthermore, the combination of Reardon and Dorfman also fails to disclose or suggest the computer recited in independent claim 16, particularly an IEEE 1394 interface comprising one or more ports only one of which is a management port deemed to be the only authorized port for receiving one or more management commands and where all other ports are not authorized for receiving any management command. Moreover, the applied art, even when taken in combination, does not disclose or suggest the 1394 interface in the computer of claim 16 further requiring or reciting that the IEEE 1394 interface passes the management command received from the management port to the processor and ignores any management command received at any of the other ports or executing the one or more management commands received from the management port without requiring further authorization.

With respect to independent claim 21, the combination of applied art does not disclose or suggest a management command authorization component that determines whether each of the one or more management commands is authorized based on whether each of the one or more management commands was received in a management port coupled to the communication bus and without requiring further authentication or authorization, wherein the management port is a predetermined port deemed to be the only port automatically authorized for receiving the one or more management commands.

With respect to method claim 30, the combination of art does not disclose or suggest identifying a first device coupled to a first port of the computer and a second device coupled to a second port of the computer, first port configured to be a management port and deemed to be the only port automatically authorized for receiving one or more management commands such that all other ports are not automatically authorized for receiving any management command. Moreover, the applied art does not disclose or suggest the further step in which when the management command was received at the management command automatically authorizing execution of the management command irrespective of an identifier of the first device and

without requiring further authentication or authorization and executing the authorized management command and when a management command was received at the second port, not authorizing the management command.

In sum, the applied art simply fails to disclose or suggest the invention as now recited in each of the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the above reasons taken alone or in combination, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 Dorfman-Reardon rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Dorfman-Reardon-Palm Rejection

It appears that claims 4, 16-29, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorfman, Reardon and further in view of Palm (USP 6,873,652). Applicants have surmised that Reardon is part of this rejection although it is not explicitly stated in paragraph 11 of the Office Action. This is because the detailed explanation of the rejection does refer to Reardon. Thus, it appears that paragraph 11 simply has a typographical error. In any event, Applicants traverse the rejection.

All of the above arguments against the base combination of Reardon and Dorfman are hereby incorporated by reference. Palm is merely applied to teach that an IEEE 1394 interface is a conventional interface. Although Applicants agree that the IEEE 1394 interface is quite conventional, Palm does not remedy any of the noted deficiencies in the base combination of Reardon and Dorfman. Indeed, Palm is only applied to teach the IEEE 1394 interface conventionality and does not disclose or suggest the above-noted deficiencies in the base combination of Reardon and Dorfman. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 Reardon-Dorfman-Palm rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael R. Cammarata Reg. No. 39,491 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant